

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

|   |   |                                    |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Andrew Sean Plummer, #70638,              | ) |                                    |
|   | ) |                                    |
| Plaintiff,                                | ) |                                    |
|   | ) |                                    |
| vs.                                       | ) | Civil Action No. 8:07-2741-TLW-BHH |
|   | ) |                                    |
| George Goodwin, Officer, Lieber           | ) |                                    |
| Correctional Institution, <u>et. al</u> , | ) |                                    |
|   | ) |                                    |
| Defendants.                               | ) |                                    |
| _____                                     | ) |                                    |

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Andrew Plummer (“plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action on August 10, 2007. (Doc. #1). The plaintiff filed amended complaints on August 14, 2007 and August 15, 2007. (Doc. #3, Doc. #4). The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on April 7, 2009. (Doc. #24). The plaintiff filed a response in opposition to the motion for summary judgment on July 21, 2009. (Doc. #35). The defendants filed a reply on August 6, 2009. (Doc. #39). The plaintiff filed a document responding to the defendant’s reply on August 20, 2009. (Doc. #40). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC.

This matter comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #64). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted and that the complaint be dismissed with prejudice. (Doc. #64). The plaintiff filed no objections to the report. Objections were due on November 30, 2009.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate

Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #64). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendants' motion for summary judgment, (Doc. #24), is hereby **GRANTED**, and this action is dismissed with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

January 29, 2010  
Florence, South Carolina